

rope's spirit from liberation to liberation until in the thin air of highest outward freedom the wings of that spirit falter and the crash dive into nihilism begins.

As now, long after the spirit's explosion into the nineteenth century's spiritual vacuum, the physical body of Europe, too, lies shattered on the ground, what is to be done? Physically, Weber answers, the Europe of the recent past, this conglomerate of sovereign states, can never be reborn. With the rise of the United States and the U.S.S.R. to world dominance, there must be a final farewell to nationalist European history. However, rebirth of the European spirit is possible and is possible not despite but precisely because of the catastrophe which has provided that "universal, life-spanning experience" which Weber had stipulated long before the war.

Except for a few religious enclaves the European masses have been systematically robbed of every higher view of life, have become herd-minded and debased. The ultimate task, then, is to change the heart and the mind of the common man. But, in order to quicken the spirit of the masses, a human leaven is indispensable, and this can only be an élite.

Creation of an élite which must be of high intellectual caliber and equipped for practical and political leadership thus is the first necessity for Europe in general and Germany in particular. Carried on the wings of a great spiritual goal, such an élite must go into the people, fostering and stimulating their inborn capacities for transcendentalism, responsibility, sacrifice, self-government, and rebuilding the land of their fathers. Fascism and communism, Weber holds, have proved the unlimited possibilities of indoctrination and, although the task would be more difficult, the forces of indoctrination might well be diverted from materialist toward spiritual ends. The human material which could form such an élite is there, but it cannot work effectively unless there is

not endless military government and occupation, not police measures and political slavery, but an opening of the door to free self-government in conjunction with intensive education. . . . The Allies . . . will not fall into the error of separating from Germany essential territories that belong to her by language, culture and proper feeling. If they did that, they would be paralysing any process of spiritual healing and transformation in Germany at the start—a process that is the precondition to world peace.

This, of course, is the crucial point where the latest German frustration and tragedy come in, for evidently the only élites which the various occupying powers will tolerate in Germany are men who, bearing the stamp of foreign approval, are thereby automatically disqualified in German eyes for genuine leadership. No end to occupation is in sight, and the error of separating from Germany essential territories that belong to her by language, culture, and proper feeling is a *fait accompli*. Under these circumstances the only élite which could lead the German people out of its spiritual chaos and the nihilism of despair inevitably loses heart. Its members either emigrate spiritually into their ivory towers, or else they emigrate in the body. Of this despairing attitude poets like Wiechert and Weber himself are examples, inasmuch as both reportedly have migrated or are on the point of following a call to Switzerland. The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak.

HEINRICH HAUSER

Wittenberg, Missouri

The Recruitment, Selection, and Training of Social Scientists. By ELBRIDGE SIBLEY. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1948. Pp. xv+163.

This monograph is the report of the Council's 1947 study of graduate training in the social sciences in American universities. The study was focused primarily on the recruitment and subsidization of personnel. Its admitted purpose, as originally designed, was to serve as a basis for a reconsideration of the Council's fellowship policies in the postwar years. However, sometime after the study was under way, its emphasis shifted from problems connected with recruiting and subsidizing students to the question of how to train more adequately those attracted to the social sciences.

The study began with the premise (pp. 6-7) that the development of science is a function of the intellectual capacity of scientists. Inferences originally drawn from this premise were (1) that the natural sciences are staffed by more capable men than the social sciences; (2) that the natural sciences recruit better students than the social sciences; and (3) that the social sciences would develop faster if they were able to recruit "brighter" students.

These assumptions were tested empirically on a sample drawn from the following institutions: Amherst, Brown, Chicago, Harvard, Oberlin, Antioch, Iowa, and Reed; the sample included the undergraduate records of 2,875 liberal arts college graduates for the 1938 and 1946 classes trained in the social and natural sciences. An analysis of the records of these students revealed that the social sciences attracted about the same proportion of outstanding and superior students as the natural sciences did, but the social sciences had a disproportionate share of the mediocre and inferior students (Table 4 and Fig. 4, pp. 24-25). Although this finding is interesting, what is of significance is: Do graduate students in the natural and social sciences exhibit differential ability as measured by their undergraduate records?

Sibley gives us a conflicting answer. He states (p. 31) that graduate students "in social science departments are not greatly inferior in previous scholastic achievement, and presumptively in innate ability, to those in natural science departments." However, a rather different summary statement is made (p. 39). Here we are told that "in the graduate schools nearly one half of the social science majors come from the lower two thirds of their undergraduate classes." Patently, both statements cannot be true. If the former one is, then the social sciences have nothing to fear with respect to ability. However, if the latter is the case, it looks as though the graduate schools and their subordinate departments have some house-cleaning to do. The report concedes that the data used "neither prove nor disprove any important hypothesis concerning" the native ability of social science students. They show, however, that the social sciences are recruiting very capable young people and that "the ablest members of each generation" are not being drawn away from the field.

After Sibley had satisfied himself that his original premise was unsound, he apparently shifted his interest to the question: Are the social sciences training the recruits they get as adequately as the natural sciences are their recruits?

Briefly the answer is "No," for both undergraduate and graduate training. The report boldly summarizes the situation on the undergraduate level:

Courses labeled social science are frequently quite non-scientific. . . . In physics or chemistry, for example, the undergraduate curriculum typically consists of a consecutive series of courses leading

toward preparation for advanced scientific work. The sequence may even begin in the latter years of high school and extend without interruption into the graduate school. Mastery of basic laboratory techniques is stressed early in the curriculum, and students are typically required to gain a knowledge of underlying subjects such as mathematics. The social science departments on the other hand are, as was observed in an earlier chapter, endeavoring to satisfy heterogeneous groups of students, some of whom are interested in social science in the strict sense of the word, but more of whom seek either a general education or some specific substantive knowledge which they believe will be useful to them in their vocations. Hence undergraduate instruction in social disciplines consists largely of the dispensations of descriptive factual information and ethical pronouncements [pp. 68-69].

Particular emphasis is placed on the fact that only a small proportion of social science undergraduates who enter graduate schools are equipped with "tools" to do effective work: "statistics," foreign languages, a scientific attitude, and mastery of scientific principles and techniques (p. 75). Sibley believes that far too many graduate students in the social sciences possess verbal facility rather than these more elementary "tools."

A number of recommendations are made which aim toward the improvement of training recruits so that they may be better qualified as research social scientists. These include "a core curriculum" in social science, presumably on the undergraduate level, careful training in "the principles of inference from quantitative data" (p. 95); some training in psychology; practical research training of young people under the guidance of mature scientists; and a definite period of undistracted training. Most of these recommendations mean that the social sciences must have more money to do the job.

That the social sciences are severely handicapped by the lack of financial resources in comparison with the natural sciences is stressed heavily in this report. The comparative poverty of the social sciences has a number of interesting ramifications in its effects on graduate students as persons, their training, when they take their degrees, if they do, the way they are taught in graduate social science departments, the kind of research topics they pursue for their dissertations, and, above all, what they do or do not do in the way of research after the Ph.D. is attained. For instance, an average of eight years elapsed between the baccalaureate and doctoral degrees in the social sciences, but only about

five years in the natural sciences. (The sample on which this part of the study was made was composed of 581 social scientists and 575 natural scientists who responded to a detailed questionnaire mailed in 1947 to individuals who had been in residence during 1935-36 and 1946-47 in the following graduate schools: California [Berkeley], Chicago, Harvard, Iowa, Michigan, North Carolina, and Princeton.) The social science graduate students were far more prone to interrupt their graduate work to take a job than was true in the natural sciences. This difference may be traced to the greater prevalence of assistantships and fellowships in the latter fields. Whatever the reasons, the years lost between the baccalaureate and doctorate are vital in the life of the individual and are important to his career and, it is inferred, to his potentialities as a research social scientist.

The evidence is clear that the natural and social sciences both attract considerable numbers of bright, poor boys, but the number of capable young men in need of financial assistance in graduate schools who are aided by assistantships and fellowships is much larger in the natural sciences than the social sciences. This results in more social science graduate students being forced to rely upon their own resources for support than is the case in the natural sciences. Some possible effects of this condition are the loss of capable men to the social sciences, the loss of interest in research, the loss of energy, and eventually the slowing-down of research contributions. Unquestionably one of the major problems of the social sciences is the lack of money with which to train young scientists and to carry out research after men are trained.

This monograph is recommended for study by graduate deans, department heads, faculty, and graduate students. It is well written; its reasoning is close; its message is of vital importance to every professional social scientist. Finally, it puts in print a number of things which need to be said of the abilities, training, and potentialities of social scientists, as well as of the handicaps under which they work in comparison with the natural sciences.

AUGUST B. HOLLINGSHEAD

Yale University

The Present State of American Sociology. By EDWARD SHILS. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1948. Pp. 64. \$0.75.

Mr. Shils has examined the patient and finds that all is not well. The symptoms are: a vast disorder, very little cumulative growth, an all-too-frequent indifference to the formation of a general theory, a failure to organize research in terms of hypotheses to be tested, preoccupation with the trivial, and something called "aimless and enthusiastic botanizing." The diagnosis is: American sociologists are notoriously deficient in historical knowledge, have not developed the philosophical and logical skills necessary for analysis of ideas, are ignorant of contemporary large-scale societies other than their own, and know practically nothing about law, economics, or politics (other than gang or local politics). The proposed cure consists of: (a) the necessary interpenetration of theory and research and the achievement of a fruitful interdependence between theory and experiment—in other words, theory-oriented research and research-oriented theory; (b) the development of an adequate dynamic theory of personality with roots in empirical observation as a necessary condition for the development of a theory of social structure; and (c) the formulation of a moral and political philosophy as a guide in the more discriminating selection of problems for study. The cure may be taken at Harvard, where the Department of Social Relations will provide the necessary opportunity to "synthesize technical virtuosity, analytical vigor, historical breadth, psychological imagination and a value-directed sense of relevance in the selection of problems."

The trends and conditions Shils records are unquestionably present in American sociology. The crucial issue, however, is: *To what extent* are they present? To this quantitative formulation of the question his essay does not provide an answer. Since the method of illustration proves nothing, there is not much point to countering Shils's sweeping generalizations with specific examples of American sociologists who do not fit them, but instances come readily to mind. It is not clear whether or not Shils subscribes to the proposition he mentions in his footnote tribute to Ogburn, namely, that reliable answers to questions must be quantitative answers, but by this test his description of American sociology is seriously limited.

Although he purports to provide a comprehensive view of the major aspects of American sociology, Shils's review is narrowly confined to seven areas of study: urban sociology and community surveys, class stratification, ethnic groups, the family, religion, communications